KS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,331	10/12/1999	SHUAN S. AMINI	EYEC-001/00U	6010

7590 10/02/2003

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON & KINDNESS
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle,, WA 98101

EXAMINER
AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	15

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/416,331	Shuan Amini et al.
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Shawn An	2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *three* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov 22, 2002* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. As per Applicant's instructions in Paper 11 as filed on 11/22/02, claims 1, 4, 13, 16, 17, and 27 have been amended, and claims 31-50 have been newly added.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-18, 20, 22-23, 25, 27-29, 33, 37-38, 41, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Acosta et al (6,166,729).

Acosta et al discloses a centralized video surveillance and monitoring system (Fig. 1, 10), comprising:

a control server (Fig. 1, 18) coupled to a private network (14) that enables communication with surveillance cameras (12) corresponding to geographical sites, wherein at least two surveillance cameras correspond to geographically distinct sites (remote locations) (abs.; col. 1, lines 61-67 and col. 2, lines 1-2) as specified in claims 1-2, 6, 16-17, and 27-29.

Acosta further discloses a centralized off site control site (Fig. 1, 16), including an image database (col. 17, lines 48-53) and at least one server (Fig. 5) being operative to initialize communications between the surveillance cameras (12) and at least one off-site client workstation (22) coupled to the public network (internet), to coordinate the retrieval of video images from the cameras, to produce the retrieved video images, and to archive the retrieved video images in the database for subsequent production to at least one client workstation, wherein the client workstation cannot initialize communication with the surveillance cameras (summary) as also specified in claims 7, 9, 18, and 20.

Regarding claim 3, Acosta et al discloses private network (14) coupled to a camera server (col. 10, lines 18-21), which is coupled to one or more surveillance cameras (12).

Regarding claim 4, Acosta discloses cameras producing composite NTSC video signals, and operable to capture the NTSC signals and convert NTSC video signals (Fig. 2, 12).

Regarding claims 11 and 22, Acosta discloses a video image record further including information, which identified an event, which led to capture of the video image data (col. 8, lines 1-27) as specified.

Regarding claims 12 and 23, Acosta discloses the off site server being operative to receive event data from a client site and to perform a course of action based upon parameters in a configuration file (col. 13, lines 22-67 and col. 14, lines 1-22) as specified.

Regarding claims 47-48, Acosta discloses generating a web-based user interface for displaying the video image data (col. 27, lines 58-60).

Regarding claims 14 and 25, Acosta discloses the off-site server being operative to issue a request for video data upon receipt of identifying an event (col. 9, lines 46) as specified.

Regarding claim 33, Acosta et al discloses a server controlling the retrieval of real-time video data corresponding to a time parameter in the configuration file (col. 2, lines 37-42).

Regarding claim 37-38, Acosta et al discloses the server (18) generating an web-based interface for displaying real-time video images from a client sites (22).

Regarding claim 41, Acosta et al discloses extracting real time video data from the camera utilizing block data management scheme (Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 19, 21, 24, 26, 30-32, 39-40, 42-43, and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al (6,166,729).

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner takes official notice that a camera such as a web/network camera in a self contained web server is obviously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a video surveillance and monitoring system as taught by Acosta et al to incorporate the web camera so as to monitor a surveillance area.

Regarding claims 8 and 19, the Examiner takes official notice that it is considered a simple design modification to change Acosta's video data to a temporary file, which is well known in the art, and obviously rename the temp file to the file that is retrievable by the client workstation, if the user deemed it necessary.

Regarding claims 10, 21, and 42-43, the Examiner takes official notice that it is obviously well known in the art for a video image recorded including video image data and a date-time value including a time-zone offset value so that an user knows exact date and time of any event of the recorded video data from any zoned area.

Regarding claims 13, 15, 24, 26, and 31, the Examiner takes official notice that sending an e-mail message and a text page (via Fax) from a server to one or more recipients alerting the event is well known in the art (note: Vaios (6,271,752 B1); col. 2, lines 26-33).

Regarding claim 30, Acosta et al discloses JavaScripts (col. 27, lines 38-53). Additionally, the Examiner takes official notice that Java code and hypertext transport protocol are conventionally well known in the art (note: Vaios; col. 7, lines 39-56).

Regarding claim 32, the Examiner takes official notice that a server operating to associate time-zone offset to the real time video data is conventional and well known in the art so as to incorporate the differences in actual time between time zones.

Regarding claims 39-40 and 49-50, the Examiner takes official notice that a web-based interface comprising a number of hyperlinks corresponding to predefined periods of time or months in a year and operable to generate additional screen interfaces, are strictly design choice (web-based design) and conventional in the art.

7. Claims 34-36 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al (6,166,729) in view of Ono (6,133,941).

Acosta et al does not particularly disclose a server generating a camera control code instructing the cameras to move in a predefined position.

However, Ono teaches a camera control server (Fig. 1, 11) generating a camera control code (11b) for instructing the cameras to move in a predefined position after a designated period of time as specified in claims 34-36 and 44-46.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a video surveillance and monitoring system as taught by Acosta et al to incorporate a camera control server as taught by Ono so as to instruct the Acosta et al's cameras to move to a series of predefined positions when desired by clients or a surveillance monitor.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

A) Vaios (6,271,752 B1), Intelligent multi-access system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn An whose telephone number (703) 305-0099 and schedule are Tuesday-Friday.

SHAWN S. AN
PATENT EXAMINER

SSA

September 24, 2003